

REMARKS

Applicant's statement of substance of interview.

Applicants wish to express appreciation to Examiner Hai C. Pham for the courtesy of an interview which was granted to Applicant's representative Michael Faibisch (Reg. No. 48,427). The interview was held at the USPTO on June 28, 2006. The Examiner's summary of the substance of the interview is set forth in the Interview Summary, Paper No. 10060628, to which Applicants have nothing to add.

General Remarks

Claims 1 – 43 were pending in the application. The allowance of claims 15 – 22 and 36 – 43 is acknowledged with appreciation.

Claims 12 and 33 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 1, 13, 14, 23, 34 and 35 are currently amended. No new matter was added to the claims.

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action in the present application. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 12 and 33 stand objected to under 35 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form. These claims have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer thus obviating the present objection.

Claims 13 – 14 are currently amended to depend directly from claim 1, and claims 34 – 35 are currently amended to depend directly from claim 23.

Acknowledgement of Allowance

The allowance of claims 15 – 22 and 36 – 43 is acknowledged with appreciation. No further amendment of these claims is currently made.

Allowable Subject Matter

The indication of claims 7 – 11 and 29 – 32 as objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims is acknowledged with appreciation. In view of amendment to the base claims (claims 1 and 23 respectively), further amendment of claims 7 – 11 and 29 – 32 is obviated.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Montroy et al. (U.S. 5,788,352). Claims 1 – 4, 12 – 14, 23 – 26 and 33 – 35 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kane et al. (U.S. 6,753,931). Claims 5 and 27 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kane et al. in view of Walker et al. (U.S. 5,327,451). Claims 6 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC over Kane et al., Walker et. al. and Ishizuka et al. (U.S. 6,617,801). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as applied to the rejected claims.

Montroy et al. shows and describes a multiplexed multi-image source display writing system in which sequential imaging apparatus is used to alternately generate first and second images for display. The images are projected at different angles. Kane et al. shows and describes pulse sequencing for generating a color image in laser based display systems. Although laser light pulses are shown to each impinge on optics at an angle normal thereto, the pulses impinge on the optics at different locations. Walker et al. shows and describes a laser diode assembly for a laser scanning system in which drive apparatus for driving the laser diode has a duty cycle which reduces an astigmatism and substantially controls temperature

dependence of the astigmatism. Ishizuka et al. shows and describes a drive device for a light emitting panel and a portable terminal device including a light emitting panel.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, “a plurality of solid state light emitters disposed relative to a location and operative to emit light impinging on said location” and “a scanner operative to sequentially receive light from said plurality of solid state light emitters at said location at essentially the same angle of incidence and to provide a time-multiplexed light output.” Claim 23 has been amended to recite, “disposing a plurality of solid state light emitters relative to a location; emitting light from a plurality of solid state light emitters to impinge on said location; and scanning said emitters to sequentially receive light at said location at essentially the same angle of incidence ...” Support for these amendments can be found at Figs. 1 and 2 as well as paragraph [0040] of the published written specification, *inter alia*.

These features are not shown or described in any of the prior art, alone or in combination. Montroy fails to show or describe light from a plurality of solid state light emitters impinging at a location at essentially the same angle of incidence, *inter alia*. Kane fails to show or describe a plurality of solid state light emitters disposed relative to a location and operative to emit light that impinges on that location, *inter alia*. Emitters, as seen in the prior art references, that are themselves at different locations can not each emit light to impinge on the same location at the same angle of incidence. As seen in Fig. 1 of Kane, for example, light from each of the light emitters 12, 16 and 20 impinges on a different location on optics 26. None of these deficiencies in Montroy or Kane or are remedied by any of the other cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claim 1, and of claims 2 – 6, 13 and 14 which depend directly and ultimately from claim 1 and are each patentable at least be virtue of their dependency from a patentable main claim, and to withdraw the rejection of claim 23, and of claims 24 – 26, 34 and 35 which depend directly and ultimately from claim 23 and are each patentable at least be virtue of their dependency from a patentable main claim. Claims 11, 12, 32 and 33 stand canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus obviating rejection of these claims.


AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLICATION NO. 10/762,246
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q79575

Conclusion and request for telephone interview

In view of the foregoing, this application is believed to be in order. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 24, 2006